UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,551	04/19/2001	Stephen F. Bisbee	003670-074	1293

7590 04/22/2005	EXAMINER
Michael G. Savage, Esquire	FLEURANTIN, JEAN B
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/839,551	BISBEE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JEAN B. FLEURANTIN	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 December 2004</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-41</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☒ Claim(s) <u>18-41</u> is/are allowed.

6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 10-17</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) <u>6-9</u> is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Claims 1-41 remain pending for examination.

Response to Applicant' Remarks

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 06 December 2004 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive for the following reasons, see sections A and B.

However, with respect to claims 18-41 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The

rejection(s) of claims 18-41 has been withdrawn as indicated in section 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

A.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for

the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public
use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United
States.

Claims 1-5 and 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. No.

5,999,711 issued to Misra (hereinafter "Misra").

As per claims 1, Misra discloses, "a method of enabling access to a resource of a processing

system" (see col. 1, line 49 to col. 2, line 21), comprising the steps of

"establishing a secure communication session between a user desiring access and a logon

component of the processing system", (see col. 1, line 60 to 2, line 3);

"verifying that logon information, provided by the user to the logon component during the secure

communication session, matches stored information identifying the user to the processing system", (see

col. 1, line 66 to 2, line 4);

"generating a security context from the logon information and authorization information that is necessary for access to the resource", (see col. 1, line 50-55);

"providing the security context to the user", (see col. 1, lines 55-62); and

"sending, by the user to the processing system, the security context and a request for access to the resource", (see col. 1, line 60 to col. 2, line 3).

As per claims 2 and 16, Misra discloses, "wherein the resource is at least one of a processor, a program object, and a record of the processing system", (see col. 4, lines 30-35).

As per claim 3, Misra discloses, "wherein the logon component provides a symmetric encryption key to the user in establishing the secure communication session", (see col. 7, lines 35-44).

As per claim 4, Misra discloses, "wherein the logon information includes a password and at least one of a user identifier, an organization identifier, a sub-organization identifier, a user location, a user role, and a user position", (see col. 5, lines 45-55).

As per claim 5, Misra discloses, "wherein the logon information is verified by checking for agreement between the stored information identifying the user to the processing system and the password and at least one of a user identifier, an organization identifier, a sub-organization identifier, a user location, a user role, and a user position provided by the user to the logon component", (see col. , lines 35-45).

As per claim 10, Misra further discloses, "the step of determining, by a stateless component of the processing system, based on the security context sent with the request for access by the user, whether access to the requested resource should be granted to the user" as the authorization database holds no information about the user, (see col. 9, lines 20-35).

As per claim 11, Misra discloses, "wherein the communication device at least partially encrypts the request for access with a symmetric encryption key included in the security context", (see col. b, lines 15-20).

As per claim 12, Misra discloses, "wherein a hash value is computed over the request for access, the hash value is included with the security context and the request for access sent by the user to the processing system, the integrity of the request for access is checked based on the hash value, and access is granted only if the integrity of the hash value is verified", (see col. 6, lines 1-15).

As per claim 13, Misra discloses, "wherein the user digitally signs the request for access, the user's digital signature is included with the security context and the request for access sent by the user to the processing system, the user's digital signature is checked by the processing system, and access to the resource is granted only if the user's digital signature is authenticated" (see col. 9, lines 15-40).

As per claim 14, Misra discloses, "wherein the request for access comprises a wrapper", (see col. 1, lines 49-60).

As per claim 15, Misra further discloses, "the step, after access to the requested resource is granted, of sending a response to the user that includes a request counter that enables the user to match the response to the request for access", (see col. 5, lines 46-54).

As per claim 17, Misra discloses, "wherein the user sends the request counter and access to the resource is denied if the request counter differs from a predetermined value", (see col. 2, lines 8-29).

B.   In response to applicant's argument, page 4, that "Misra fails to disclose each of the features

recited in claim 1." It is submitted that Misra discloses the limitations of claim 1: "a method of enabling

access to a resource of a processing system" (see col. 1, line 49 to col. 2, line 21), comprising the steps

of

"establishing a secure communication session between a user desiring access and a logon

component of the processing system", (see col. 1, line 60 to 2, line 3);

"verifying that logon information, provided by the user to the logon component during the secure

communication session, matches stored information identifying the user to the processing system", (see

col. 1, line 66 to 2, line 4);

"generating a security context from the logon information and authorization information that is

necessary for access to the resource", (see col. 1, line 50-55);

"providing the security context to the user", (see col. 1, lines 55-62); and

"sending, by the user to the processing system, the security context and a request for access to

the resource", (see col. 1, line 60 to col. 2, line 3).

Furthermore, Misra discloses the principal may send a request to logon to the distributed system

along with the certificate of credentials that is received by the distributed system. The secure package is

accessed to enable the facility for checking credentials to determine whether the principal is authorized to

connect to the distributed system. Where the principal is not authorized to connect to the distributed

system (see col. 1, line 64 to col. 2, line 5).

MPEP 2111 Claim Interpretation; Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable

interpretation consistent with the specification" Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims

during prosecussion and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once

issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA

1969). The court found that applicant was advocating ... the impermissible importation of subject matter

from the specification into the claim. See also In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023,

1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The court held that the PTO is not required, in the course of prosecution, to

interpret claims in applications in the same manner as a court would interpret claims in an infringement

suit. Rather, the "PTO applies to verbiage of the proposed claims the broadest reasonable meaning of

the words in their ordinary usage as they would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, taking

into account whatever enlightenment by way of definition or otherwise that may be afforded by the written

description contained in application's specification.").

The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the

interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. In re Cortright, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d

1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

For the above reasons, it is believed that the last Office Action was proper.

Allowable Subject Matter

3.   Claims 6-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any

intervening claims.

With respect to claims 18-41 are allowed over the prior art of record.

The prior art of record fails to teach of suggest:

A method of accessing a resource of a processing system, comprising the steps of: providing by

a user logon information to a logon component of the processing system during a secure communication

session between the user and the processing system; verifying that the provided logon information

matches stored information identifying the user to the processing system; generating a security context

from the logon information and authorization information that is necessary for access to the resource,

wherein the security context comprises a plaintext header and an encrypted body; the plaintext header

comprises a security context ID, a key handle, and an algorithm identifier and key size; and the encrypted

body comprises at least one of a user identifier, an organization identifier, access information, an

expiration time, public key information, symmetric key information, and a hash; providing the security

context to the user; sending, by the user to the processing system, the security context and a request for

access to the resource; and determining, by a stateless component of the processing system, based on the security context sent with the request for access by the user, whether access to the requested resource should be granted to the user as recited in claim 18.

A processing system having resources that are selectively accessible to users, the resources including processors, program objects, and records, the processing system comprising: a communication device through which a user desiring access to a resource communicates sends and receives information in a secure communication session with the processing system; an information database that stores information identifying users to the processing system and authorization information that identifies resources accessible to users and that is necessary for access to resources; and a logon component that communicates with the communication device and with the information database, wherein the logon component receives logon information provided by the user during the secure communication session, verifies the received logon information by matching against information identifying the user to the processing system that is retrieved from the information database, and generates a security context from the received logon information and authorization information; wherein the logon component provides the security context to the user's communication device, and the user sends, to the processing system, the security context and a request for access to a resource as recited in claim 29.

The dependent claims, being definite, further limiting, and fully enabled by the specification are also allowed.

Conclusion

4.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office

action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of

the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from

the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date

of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH

shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action

is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX

MONTHS from the date of this final action.

CONTACT INFORMATION

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to JEAN B. FLEURANTIN whose telephone number is 571 – 272-4035. The examiner can

normally be reached on 7:05 to 4:35.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

JOHN E BREENE can be reached on 571 – 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where

this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)

at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jean Bolte Fleurantin
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
April 16, 2005

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER